```
1
                                 Trial Day 2
                                Volume 1 of 1
   2
                             November 13, 1997
   3
                    IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
   4
                       FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND
                             NORTHERN DIVISION
  5
  6
      GLAXO WELLCOME INC., et al.
  7
                 Plaintiffs
                                        Civil Docket No. AMD-96-455
  8
                                        And
           v.
                                        Civil Docket No. AMD-96-1853
  9
                                              (Consolidated)
      PHARMADYNE CORPORATION, et al.)
 10
                Defendants
 11
 12
                                                 Baltimore, Maryland
                                                 November 13, 1997
 13
                                                 10:10 a.m.
 14
            The above-entitled matter came on for trial before
15
                      The Honorable Andre M. Davis.
16
                          APPEARANCES
17
          On behalf of the Plaintiffs:
18
                Stephen Judlowe, Esquire
                John Henry Lewin, Jr., Esquire
19
               Brian P. Murphy, Esquire
               Robert Gibbons, Esquire
20
               Regina Ambery, Esquire
               Jason Lief, Esquire
21
          On behalf of the Defendants:
22
               James Rubin, Esquire
               Alan H. Bernstein, Esquire
23
               Robert S. Silver, Esquire
               John M. Seeberger, Esquire
24
               Deborah K. Besche, Esquire
     Reported by: Betty Lou Walls, RPR
25
                          WALLS REPORTING, INC.
                  714 PARK AVENUE, BALTIMORE, MD 21201
                    410-728-9020
                                     FAX 410-728-9024
```

```
INDEX
  2
                                   VOIR
      WITNESS:
                          DIRECT
                                   DIRE CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS
  3
      David R. Long
                          403
                                         428
  4
      Paul E. Wray
                       469
  5
  6
  7
  8
 9
 10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
                        WALLS REPORTING, INC.
                 714 PARK AVENUE, BALTIMORE, MD 21201
                   410-728-9020
                                  FAX 410-728-9024
```

```
the examiner's rejection, and toward the bottom of the page,
  1
      again, this was referenced earlier in Dr. Long's testimony,
  2
      the applicant states, quote: However, the purpose for which
  3
      ethanol has been included has been either as a solvent or as
  4
      a preservative against bacterial contamination. There was,
  5
      however, no reason to suppose that either of these functions
  6
      of ethanol would have had any beneficial effect in terms of
  7
      limiting the degradation of ranitidine in aqueous
  8
      formulations thereof. Close quote.
  9
 10
                Do you agree with that statement?
            Yes, I agree. It's consistent with my experience also.
 11
            There was reference earlier to Tagamet syrup.
 12
      the active ingredient in Tagamet?
13
            The active ingredient in Tagamet is the chemical entity
14
15
     Cimetidine.
16
            It's not ranitidine hydrochloride, right?
17
           No, it's dissimilar.
18
           It's a free-based salt?
19
           That's correct.
20
           As of the effective date of the filing this
     application, which is December 12, 1986, the date that Dr.
21
     Long files his very first application in the United Kingdom,
22
     as of that date are you aware of any publication prior to
23
     that date that discloses the purpose of why ethanol was added
24
25
     to Tagamet?
```

WALLS REPORTING, INC.
714 PARK AVENUE, BALTIMORE, MD 21201
410-728-9020 FAX 410-728-9024

```
1
       A
             No, I'm not aware.
   2
             And prior to that date, December 12, 1986, are you
      aware of any publication suggesting that adding ethanol to
   3
      Tagamet syrup would enhance the chemical stability of the
  4
  5
      solution?
  6
            No, I'm not.
            Are you aware of any publication prior to that date
  7
      suggesting that adding ethanol to any pharmaceutical
  8
      formulation would enhance chemical stability of the solution?
 10
            No, I'm not.
            Dr. Wray, based on this filing, did the examiner
 11
      ultimately allow all of the claims in the patent application?
 12
            He did allow all the claims ultimately. I think there
 13
      was data submitted -- oh, yes, there was data submitted at
14
      this time to this rejection, and it was allowed after that,
15
16
     yes.
           Thank you, Dr. Wray. You may set aside that exhibit
17
     and I would like to change topics now and discuss the
18
     defendants' development of generic ranitidine oral solution.
19
               Dr. Wray, you indicated earlier that you have read
20
     the UDL Laboratory notebooks and document reports pertaining
21
     to UDL's development of ranitidine oral solution?
22
23
     A
           Yes, I did.
24
           You read all the notebooks of Dr. Gullapalli which
25
     contain description of his experiments?
                          WALLS REPORTING, INC.
```

714 PARK AVENUE, BALTIMORE, MD 21201

FAX 410-728-9024

410-728-9020

Trial Day 13 Volume 1 of 2 December 18, 1997

Page 4801

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND NORTHERN DIVISION

GLAXO WELLCOME INC., et al.

Plaintiffs

v.

Civil Docket No. AMD-96-455

and

Civil Docket No. AMD-96-1853 (Consolidated)

PHARMADYNE CORPORATION, et al.

Defendants

Baltimore, Maryland December 18, 1997 10:00 a.m.

The above-entitled matter was continued on for trial before
The Honorable Andre M. Davis

APPEARANCES

On Behalf of the Plaintiffs: Stephen Judlowe, Esquire John Henry Lewin, Jr., Esquire Brian P. Murphy, Esquire Robert G. Gibbons, Esquire Regina Ambery, Esquire Jason Lief, Esquire

On Behalf of the Defendants: James Rubin, Esquire Alan H. Bernstein, Esquire Robert S. Silver, Esquire John M. Seeberger, Esquire Deborah K. Besche, Esquire

Page 4812 Is there anywhere in this reference where it discloses why 1 2 alcohol was added? 3 A No. Dr. Wray, you have been here for the entire trial, and you 4 have heard all or just about all of the testimony; is that 5 6 right? 7 A Yes. 8 You were here for Dr. Long's testimony? 9 Yes. Did Glaxo use ethanol in their original formulation for 10 ranitidine hydrochloride oral solution? 11 12 No, they did not. At that time, did Glaxo know about, based on the evidence 13 that you heard, Tagamet syrup containing alcohol or ethanol? 14 15 They must have known. 16 Can you tell us why, in your opinion, based on the evidence, Glaxo did not use ethanol at least in its original 17 18 formulation for Zantac oral solution? I believe they did not include ethanol because they felt 19 20 they did not need it. 21 With respect to the active ingredient in the Tagamet syrup, 22 specifically ranitidine, is that, in your opinion, chemically the same kind of compound as ranitidine? 23 24 No, it is not. It's quite different. Α 25 Can you explain the differences, please?

2

3

1

5

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

- Well, the ranitidine hydrochloride is considered an enamine, which has a specific chemical structure. cimetidine is a guanidine product. Specifically, it's a cyano-derivative of guanidine. They have totally different ring structures in addition to these differences in the side chains.
- Is either ranitidine or cimetidine considered an amide?
- No, they are not.
- Dr. Wray, I am going to put up on the easel a couple of Specifically, I am going to start with claim 1 of exhibits. the '249 patent, and I am going to put up Plaintiffs' Exhibit Number 419.

(Pause in the proceeding.)

- Dr. Wray, when I began your examination this morning, I asked you if you had made a comparison of the prior references to the claims of the '249 patent, and you indicated that you did; is that correct?
- Yes, I did.
- Does Plaintiffs' Exhibit 419, which is on the left-hand easel, accurately reflect your opinion and analysis of the prior references cited by defendants in connection with the '249 patented invention?
- Yes, it does.
- Beginning with Plaintiffs' Exhibit 419 and, where appropriate, making reference to the '249 patent claim 1, which